

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the patent to Schustek.

With the present Amendment applicants first of all amended the specification to bring it in compliance with the requirements of the U.S. Patent Practice.

Also, the original claims have been canceled and replaced with a new set of claims including claim 13, the broadest claim on file, and the dependent claims which depend on claim 13.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 15, the broadest claim on file, clearly and patentably distinguishes the present invention from the references applied by the Examiner. This claim defines, in addition to the features of the original claim 1, the features of claim 2 or in other words the feature that a blind rivet is used as the rivet in the inventive method. This clearly and patentably distinguishes the present invention from the prior art.

The patent to Schustek applied by the Examiner discloses different possibilities for mounting of excitation poles. Figure 2 shows a conventional rivet (7, 8, 10), with which during a riveting process it is necessary to apply large riveting tools from both sides of the rivet, or in other words from the radially outer side and the radially inner side. From the radially inner side, the head part 7 must be held against the high riveting force which is applied from the radially outer side by a riveting tool.

Figure 3 illustrates the use of a double-trapezoidal profile. This profile extends from the background in the description (column 3, lines 47 and further) in an axial direction of the rotor 15. The profile is displaceable outwardly from its groove-shaped receptacles and therefore is not a rivet.

Figures 4a and 4b illustrate further modifications of the profile shown in Figure 3 and have similarly to it a rail-shaped profile with two (also rail-shaped) heads 406, 407. These profiles are inserted in axial bores 415 as disclosed in column 3, line 63. The deformed heads 407 are further expanded by a bolt 16 or a mandrel 17. These profiles are not rivets, since these profiles in one direction make possible to provide however a frictional connection between the magnets 19 and their holder 15. The magnets are releasable by axial displacement in an outer direction.

The above mentioned rail-shaped profile with two rail-shaped heads 406, 407 can not be considered as a blind rivet or in any way similar to a blind rivet.

It is therefore believed to be clear that claim 14 defines such a method which is not disclosed in the reference and can not be derived from it as a matter of obviousness.

In order to arrive at the applicant's invention the method disclosed in the reference has to be fundamentally modified by including such steps which are not disclosed in the reference and can not be derived from it as a matter of obviousness. However, there is no hint or suggestion in the method of the reference of such a modification.

As was explained herein above, the method disclosed in the reference has disadvantages which are eliminated by the method proposed in the present application. This is an additional proof that the present invention as defined in claim 13 clearly and patentably distinguishes from the method disclosed in the reference.

It is also respectfully submitted that the method proposed in the present application was developed by the inventor which developed the solution proposed in the reference as well, and in the Company which is the assignee of the present application and of the reference. It is believed to be clear that the invention disclosed in the reference was known in the Company by the inventor of the present application, and the inventor of the present application developed a new method to improve the old one. This improvement is new, unobvious, advantages, and should be considered as patentable over the method disclosed in the reference.


Claim 15, broadest claim on file, should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 13, they share its presumably allowable features, and it is respectfully submitted that these claims should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of present application is most respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Any costs involved should be charged to the deposit account of the undersigned (No. 19-4675). Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 27233

FAX COPY RECEIVED

MAR 6 - 2002

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800